

225.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-155-2020

Date of decision: 14.01.2020

SUKHWINDER SINGH

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.... Respondent

II.

CRM-M-192-2020

LOVEPREET SINGH @ PARAMJIT SINGH

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.... Respondent

III.

CRM-M-231-2020

SUKHJIT KAUR

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mrs. Ruchika Sabherwal, AAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of three petitions i.e. **CRM-M-192-**

2020 titled as ***Lovepreet Singh @ Paramjit Singh***, **CRM-M-155-2020** titled

as ***Sukhwinder Singh Versus State of Punjab*** and ***CRM-M-231-2020*** titled as ***Sukhjit Kaur Versus State of Punjab***. These petitions have been filed by the husband, father-in-law and mother-in-law respectively of the complainant.

Prayer in these petitions filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.85, dated 10.11.2013 registered under Section 406/498-A/34 of IPC at Police Station Lakho Ke Behram, District Ferozepur.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that in the aforesaid FIR, charges were framed against the accused for the offence under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC on 17.09.2015 and the case was fixed for prosecution evidence. However, on 05.10.2016 the petitioners being absented were summoned through non-bailable warrants. Since non-bailable warrants were not executed, the trial Court declared the petitioners-accused as proclaimed offenders on 02.07.2018. The petitioners were arrested in the case on 17.12.2019 and since then they are in custody.

Counsel states that the dispute in the present case is matrimonial in nature. The petitioners are in custody since 17.12.2019 and the trial in the case will take sufficient long time.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the custody.

It being a matrimonial dispute between the parties and the petitioners being in custody since 17.12.2019, the trial in the case is not likely to be concluded in the near future. Thus, this Court deems it appropriate to admit the petitioners on bail.

Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are admitted on regular bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court.

It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

The observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

14.01.2020
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No